

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The claims have been amended to define the invention with somewhat greater particularity over the art. More particularly, the main claims now positively recite that the variation of the flow cross section of the suction conduit varies the rate at which the preform is drawn through the passage.

The main reference, US patent 4,865,799 of Sadr, represents at most the admitted state of the prior art. As stated in Sadr (column 2, lines 48ff): "If desired, a vacuum can be applied to the bottom end 12 of the mold cavity 7 to facilitate loading of the parison 15 into the mold. The combination of pressure from the orifices 23 and a vacuum ensures proper mold loading." There is essentially no other mention of how this is done. Thus this reference cannot alone form any type of valid rejection of the claims in this application.

The secondary reference, US patent 6,089,851 of Lupke, shows a very complex structure for making continuous ridged tubing. As shown in FIG. 1, an extruder 2 continuously emits a parison that passes through continuous block mold 4 and issues at a continuous

and unvarying speed from the downstream end as a finished ridged pipe P. There is no variation whatsoever in the advance rate of the workpiece in the mold 4.

Admittedly, the mold 4 of Lupke is formed with a myriad of passages and has valve elements 49 (FIGS. 7 & 7A) that can vary flow into, out of, and between the various passages in the mold. This is done for various purposes, for instance to cool the workpiece. The actual shaping of the workpiece is apparently mainly done by compression of a tubular blank between ridges surfaces of the block mold 4. In no manner does flow in this mold have any effect on movement of the workpiece through the mold. Thus the combined teachings of Sadr and Lupke cannot form a valid §103 rejection of claims 1 and 6 of the instant invention.

For these reasons all the claims in the case are clearly in condition for passage to Issue. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this

Atty's 21669

Pat. App. 09/736,042

case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.

  
by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597  
Attorney for Applicant

13 October 2004  
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900  
Bronx, NY 10471-0900  
Cust. No.: 535  
Tel: (718) 884-6600  
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosure:                      None.